

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

DIANE YOUNG,

Plaintiff,

VS.

THE STANDARD FIRE
INSURANCE COMPANY, a foreign
insurance company,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-CV-31-RMP

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

NOTED FOR AUGUST 8, 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

Defendant The Standard Fire Insurance Company (“Travelers”) has a duty to act in good faith toward its insured Washington consumers in its claims investigation and processing. Travelers owes a duty of good faith under both common law and Washington statutes and insurance regulations. Under Washington’s common law of bad faith, insurers are required to give equal consideration to the insured’s interest in all matters. Washington’s insurance regulations define (1) refusing to pay a claim before conducting a reasonable investigation, (2) failure to adopt and implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation of claims, and (3) refusing to pay a claim before providing

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 1 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402

1 an insured with a consulting medical professionals reasons supporting the refusal
 2 as unfair acts. WAC 284-30-330(3), 330(4), 395(2).

3 There is no dispute of fact regarding Travelers's practice in this case.
 4 Travelers had a policy or practice of withholding and denying personal injury
 5 protection ("PIP") benefits to its Washington State insureds based on a demand
 6 for an independent medical examination ("IME") without obtaining or providing
 7 a supporting opinion from a medical or healthcare professional with whom
 8 Travelers consulted.

9 The question here is simple: can Travelers do that? Essentially, Travelers
 10 preemptively stops paying benefits prior to the IME in hopes that the results will
 11 enable it to deny benefits permanently, and that the denial pending will save it a
 12 month or two of payments while the insured remains in limbo. In the meantime,
 13 even insureds whose claims are entirely valid have payments delayed and their
 14 relationships with their medical providers disrupted.

15 This practice runs completely counter to the underlying purposes of PIP in
 16 Washington—providing prompt payment of medical bills—and constitutes bad
 17 faith. First, under WAC 284-30-330(4), Travelers denies benefits before
 18 completing a reasonable investigation, instead basing necessarily medical
 19 determinations of reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness of treatment on a
 20 claims adjuster's mere speculation and conjecture. Second, by doing so as a
 21 standard practice, it violates WAC 284-30-33(3). Third, under WAC 284-30-
 22 395(2), it denies benefits without providing the insured with written notice of the
 23 reasons supporting the denial as provided to Travelers by a medical or health care
 24 professional with whom it consulted. Finally, under Washington's common law
 25 of bad faith, Travelers fails to give equal consideration to the insured's interest
 26 during the time the claim is denied "pending."

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 2 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

Here, Plaintiff Diane Young's treating physicians implicitly confirmed that her treatment was both reasonable and necessary and related to the motor vehicle accident. See RCW 18.130.180 (implicitly - prohibiting misrepresentation by all providers licensed the by the WA State Department of Health). Thus, until the insurer receives the results of an IME or record review, it has no invalid medical basis for concluding that a reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness issue with treatment exists. Yet Travelers, placing its own interest above Ms. Young's, denied her claims pending an IME/records review.

Traveler’s systemic refusal to pay PIP benefits before obtaining a supporting medical opinion strikes at the heart of PIP’s underlying purposes and is quintessentially and unreasonably bad faith. Accordingly, Ms. Young is entitled to summary judgment on the corresponding elements of her claims based on this practice, reserving any elements of causation and damages for trial.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Substantive Facts

On May 11, 2017, Ms. Young was injured in an automobile collision; she subsequently sought medical treatment for her injuries, and at all relevant times possessed coverage for PIP benefits under an automobile insurance policy issued by Travelers. Plaintiff's Statement of Undisputed Facts (PSOF) at ¶¶ 8-10. Ms. Young's policy stated that it would pay PIP benefits to an insured suffering a "bodily injury" "caused by an accident" consisting of "[a]ll reasonable and necessary" medical expenses "incurred within three years from the date of the accident." *Id.* at ¶ 11.

Ms. Young made a claim for PIP coverage to Travelers, and Travelers initially accepted her claim and paid some of her medical bills. *Id.* at ¶¶ 13-14. However, on September 8, 2017, Travelers informed Ms. Young that it was

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 3 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402

1 asserting a “reservation of rights” regarding all medical bills submitted after
 2 September 18. *Id.* at ¶ 19. Despite admitting that it lacked sufficient information
 3 to determine that her medical treatments were not “reasonable, necessary and
 4 related to the accident,” Travelers also informed her that it was suspending
 5 payment of PIP benefits until a physician of Travelers’s choosing physically
 6 examined her in an IME. *Id.* at ¶ 19.

7 During their depositions, Travelers’s FRCP 30(b)(6) representative and
 8 even one of its IME physicians and expert witnesses testified that individuals
 9 lacking a medical degree or formal medical training are unqualified to determine
 10 whether an insured’s medical treatments are reasonable, necessary, or unrelated
 11 to an accident. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4, 22. None of the Travelers claims adjusters responsible
 12 for processing PIP claims for its Washington State insureds possess any sort of
 13 medical degree or formal medical training. *Id.* at ¶¶ 3-4. Despite this testimony,
 14 however, Travelers’s claims handling policies permit its claims adjusters to
 15 determine that a reasonableness, relatedness, or necessity issue exists based on the
 16 adjuster’s own review of an insured’s medical records and suspend payment of
 17 PIP benefits pending IME results. *Id.* at ¶ 5. In fact, Travelers’s claims handling
 18 rules **direct** its claims adjusters to suspend PIP benefits and request an IME once
 19 the adjuster determines that a reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness issue exists
 20 regarding an insured’s treatment. *Id.* Consistent with this directive, the Travelers
 21 claims adjuster who suspended payment of Ms. Young’s PIP benefits, James
 22 Olsen, did so based only on his own non-medical review of Ms. Young’s medical
 23 records. *Id.* at ¶ 19.

24 Travelers’s claims adjusters testified that the company’s “suspension” of
 25 PIP benefits after requesting an IME constitutes a denial of benefits for purposes
 26 of applicable Washington insurance regulations. *Id.* at ¶¶ 6-7. Consistent with

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 80546
 80547
 80548
 80549
 80550
 80551
 80552
 80553
 80554
 80555
 80556
 80557
 80558
 80559
 80560
 80561
 80562
 80563
 80564
 80565
 80566
 80567
 80568
 80569
 80570
 80571
 80572
 80573
 80574
 80575
 80576
 80577
 80578
 80579
 80580
 80581
 80582
 80583
 80584
 80585
 80586
 80587
 80588
 80589
 80590
 80591
 80592
 80593
 80594

1 this testimony, Mr. Olsen’s September 8, 2017 entry in Travelers’s claims systems
 2 notes for Ms. Young stated: “After 9/18 please **deny all bills . . .**” *Id.* at ¶ 17.
 3 After this date, when Ms. Young’s medical providers would submit bills to
 4 Travelers for payment, Travelers would issue Explanation of Benefits (“EOB”)
 5 refusing any payment and explaining: “IME HAS BEEN REQUESTED.
 6 PAYMENT CONSIDERED AFTER EXAMINATION.” *Id.* at ¶ 20.

7 Travelers failed to obtain medical opinions regarding the reasonableness,
 8 necessity, or relatedness of Ms. Young’s medical treatments until January 22 and
 9 February 1, 2018. *Id.* at ¶ 21. On February 16, Travelers informed Ms. Young
 10 that, based on the IME results, it would not pay for “chiropractic care, massage
 11 therapy or physical therapy beyond 9/18/17-the date we agreed to cover treatment
 12 through in our 9/8/17 correspondence.” *Id.* at ¶ 23. Travelers further stated that
 13 it would not pay for “acupuncture treatments beyond 12/4/17.” *Id.*

14 **B. Procedural History**

15 On September 13, 2018, Ms. Young filed her First Amended Complaint
 16 asserting the following claims for damages on behalf of herself as well as all other
 17 similarly-situated Washington State insureds: (1) violation of WAC provisions
 18 and statute; (2) violation of chapter 19.86 RCW, the Washington Consumer
 19 Protection Act (“CPA”); (3) breach of contract; (4) insurance bad faith; (5)
 20 violations of chapter 48.30 RCW, the Insurance Fair Conduct Act (“IFCA”); and
 21 (6) negligence. Dkt. #38 at 13-14, 18-21 (¶¶ 60, 72-92).¹ At a December 18, 2018
 22 hearing, the Court directed the parties to file cross summary judgment motions
 23 “just on the one issue . . . the suspension of PIP benefits without the IME or

24
 25
 26 ¹ Ms. Young expressly asserts a claim for negligent infliction of emotional
 distress “solely as an individual,” not on a class-wide basis. *Id.* at 21-22 (¶ 93).

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

1 pending the IME” Cochran Decl. Ex. 15. Consistent with the Court’s
 2 direction, Plaintiff now moves for partial summary judgment on her claims solely
 3 based on this issue Plaintiff alleges is common to the proposed putative class.²

4 **III. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON**

5 This motion relies upon the Declaration of Darrell L. Cochran in Support
 6 of Plaintiff’s Partial Summary Judgment Motion, as well as the pleadings,
 7 declarations, and other evidence previously filed in this case.

8 **IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

9 **A. Legal Standards**

10 Summary judgment is warranted when there is no material issue of fact for
 11 trial. *Warren v. City of Carlsbad*, 58 F.3d 439, 441 (9th Cir. 1995), *cert denied*,
 12 516 U.S. 1171 (1996). Plaintiff satisfies her burden with respect to the claims at
 13 issue by showing that there is an absence of evidence to support the claims.
 14 *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 325 (1986).

15 **B. Travelers’s “Suspension” of PIP Benefits Constituted a Refusal to
 16 Pay Claims under WAC 284-30-330(4) and a Denial, Limitation, or
 17 Termination of PIP Benefits under WAC 284-30-395**

18 RCW 48.030.010(1) prohibits insurers from engaging in unfair or deceptive
 19 acts or practices in the business of insurance. In order to effectuate this statutory

20 _____
 21 ² Necessarily, Plaintiff reserves the right to later seek summary judgment
 22 on any claims and causes of action contingent on the individualized facts unique
 23 to Ms. Young and Travelers’s handling of her PIP claims, including but not
 24 limited to Travelers timing of its IME request, the reasonableness of Travelers’s
 25 refusal to pay PIP benefits based on information obtained by Travelers after
 26 September 8, Travelers’s efforts to obtain Ms. Young’s medical records, and
 Travelers’s delay in scheduling a records review or IME.

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 6 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

protection for insureds, RCW 48.030.010(2) authorizes the Washington State Office of Insurance Commissioner (“OIC”) to promulgate regulations defining specific unfair or deceptive claims practices. One such regulation promulgated by OIC is WAC 284-30-330(4), which defines “[r]efusing to pay claims without conducting a reasonable investigation” as an unfair practice. Emphasis added. Additionally, WAC 284-30-395(2) requires an insurer, when it “intends to **deny, limit, or terminate** an insured’s medical or hospital benefits,” to inform the insured of the true and actual reason for its action “as provided to the insurer by **the medical or healthcare professional** with whom the insurer consulted.” Emphasis added.

Plaintiff anticipates that Travelers will argue that its September 8, 2017, “suspension” of PIP benefit payments pending IME results did not constitute either a refusal to pay PIP claims or a denial, limitation, or termination of PIP benefits, and that no such action occurred until February 16, 2018. But either assertion is completely contrary to the regulations’ plain language and Travelers’s own admissions.

Under Washington law, the Court “interprets regulations under the rules of statutory construction.” *Durant v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 191 Wn.2d 1, 8, 419 P.3d 400 (2018). It “construes the act as a whole, giving effect to all of the language used.” *Durant*, 191 Wn.2d at 8. “If a regulation is unambiguous, intent can be determined from the language alone, and the court will not look beyond the plain meaning of the words of the regulation.” *Id.*

First, it should be beyond doubt that Travelers’s “suspension” of PIP benefit payments constituted “refusing to pay claims” under WAC 284-30-330(4). Simply put, Ms. Young’s medical providers submitted bills to Travelers, and

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 7 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 Travelers declined to pay them, advising that it might reconsider payment
 2 contingent on IME results.

3 Second, Travelers's "suspension" of PIP benefits constitutes a denial,
 4 limitation, or termination of PIP benefits under WAC 284-30-395. Because the
 5 regulation does not define the terms "deny, limit, or terminate," the Court uses
 6 their "ordinary (dictionary) meaning." *Durant*, 191 Wn.2d at 11-12. *The Oxford*
 7 *English Dictionary* ("OED") defines "deny" as "5. To refuse or withhold
 8 (anything asked for, claimed, or desired); to refuse to give or grant" and "6. To
 9 say 'no' to, to refuse (a person who makes a request or demand). *The Oxford*
 10 *English Dictionary (Second Edition)* 467 (1989); *see also id.* at 456 (defining
 11 "denial" as "1. A. The act of saying 'no' to a request or to a person who makes a
 12 request; refusal of anything asked for or desired"). Likewise, *Webster's Third*
 13 *New International Dictionary* ("Webster's") defines "deny" as "3 . . . b: to refuse
 14 to grant "WITHHOLD." *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* 603
 15 (1986); *see also id.* 602 (defining "denial" as "1: refusal to grant, assent to, or
 16 sanction : rejection of something requested, claimed, or felt to be due").

17 Consistent with these definitions, Travelers's refusal to pay or withholding
 18 payment for Ms. Young's medical bills when her providers requested payment
 19 constituted a denial of payment. Indeed, Travelers own claims adjusters admitted
 20 that its "suspension" of PIP payments constituted a "denial" of benefits for
 21 purposes of Washington insurance regulations.

22 Moreover, Webster's defines "limit" as "3 a : to set bounds or limits to . . .
 23 b. to curtail or reduce in quantity or extent." *Id.* at 1312. Again, consistent with
 24 this definition, Travelers's "suspension" of PIP payments after September 18 both
 25 set bounds for Ms. Young's PIP benefits under the policy and curtailed or reduced
 26 the quantity of those benefits.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 8 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 Finally, the OED defines “terminate” as “4. a. To bring to an end, put an
 2 end to, cause to cease; to end (an action, condition, etc.)” and “5. To bring
 3 (something) to a stop, so that it extends no further; to put a limit or limits to; to
 4 restrict, confine.” *Id.* at 804; *see also Webster’s* at 2359 (defining “terminate” as
 5 “1 a. to bring to an ending or cessation in time, sequence, or continuity”). Once
 6 again, Traveler’s “suspension” of PIP payments after September 18—i.e., a
 7 refusal to pay beyond that date—ended, ceased, stopped, and restricted Ms.
 8 Young’s PIP benefits, which would only be reopened and reconsidered if Ms.
 9 Young received favorable IME results.

10 **C. Travelers’s Policy of “Suspending” PIP Benefit Payments Before
 11 Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Violates WAC 284-30-
 12 330(3), 330(4), and 395**

13 In general, WAC 284-30-330(4) prohibits insurers from “[r]efusing to pay
 14 claims without conducting a reasonable investigation.” Washington law makes
 15 clear that the duty imposed is one to conduct a reasonable investigation *before*
 16 refusing to pay. *Coventry Associates v. American States Ins. Co.*, 136 Wn.2d
 17 269, 279, 961 P.2d 933 (1998) (internal quotation and citation omitted) (stating
 18 that insurers are required to “complete a reasonable investigation before denying
 19 coverage”); *see also Aecon Bldgs., Inc. v. Zurich North America*, 572 F. Supp. 2d
 20 1227, 1239 (W.D. Wash. 2008) (citing duty from WAC 284-30-330(4) and
 21 holding that insurer “violated the CPA when it failed to conduct a reasonable
 22 investigation before denying Aecon’s tender”). Under this investigatory duty,
 23 “[a]n insurer does not have a reasonable basis for denying coverage and, therefore,
 24 acts without reasonable justification when it denies coverage based on suspicion
 25 and conjecture.” *Indus. Indem. Co. of the NW., Inc. v. Kallevig*, 114 Wn.2d 907,
 26 917, 792 P.2d 520 (1990).

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 9 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 In turn, Washington law imposes further limitations on insurers' refusal to
 2 pay in the PIP context. WAC 284-30-395(1) provides that there are only four
 3 reasons for which an insurer may deny, limit or terminate PIP benefits: if
 4 treatment is not "reasonable," "necessary," "related to the accident," or "incurred
 5 within three years of the accident." "These are the only grounds for denial,
 6 limitation, or termination of medical and hospital services . . ." WAC 284-30-
 7 395(1). This provision "is unambiguous: an insurer may deny PIP benefits 'only'
 8 for the reasons listed; no other reasons are permitted." *Durant*, 191 Wn.2d at 9.

9 Under facts virtually identical to those in this case, the court in *McGee-*
 10 *Grant v. Am. Family Mut. Ins.*, 157 F. Supp. 3d 939 (W.D. Wash. 2016), addressed
 11 what constitutes an unreasonable investigation before "suspending" PIP benefits.
 12 In that case, based solely on review of the insured's medical records, the insurer's
 13 claims adjuster concluded that a "relatedness issue" existed and directed that
 14 "medical bills should be denied pending an IME." *McGee-Grant*, 157 F. Supp.
 15 3d at 941. The insurer did not obtain a medical records review from a medical
 16 professional supporting its refusal to pay PIP benefits until three months later. *Id.*
 17 at 942.

18 In granting the insured's partial summary judgment motion, the *McGee-*
 19 *Grant* court reasoned that "there is no dispute that [the insurer] denied payment
 20 without an IME . . . based on a perceived 'relatedness issue,' i.e. [its] belief that
 21 the [insured's] injury was not related to the motor vehicle accident, but was
 22 instead caused by a prior injury." *Id.* at 943. The *McGee-Grant* court rejected
 23 the insurer's attempts to point to several "facts" supporting its pre-records review
 24 "relatedness" conclusion, reasoning that the insurer failed to demonstrate that its
 25 conclusions were "medically valid" and, therefore, appeared "to be based on
 26 suspicion and conjecture." *Id.* at 944. Citing several provisions of WAC 284-30-

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 10 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 330, including 330(4), it ruled that the insurer “acted in bad faith as a matter of
 2 law” by concluding that any of the grounds under WAC 284-30-395(1) exist
 3 “without a medical basis” and “deciding to refuse payment prior to an IME or
 4 records review.” *Id.*

5 As in *McGee-Grant*, in this case Travelers’s simple review of insureds’
 6 medical records by a claims adjuster is an insufficiently speculative or conjectural
 7 basis for refusing to pay PIP benefits based on a perceived reasonableness,
 8 necessity, or relatedness issue. In all PIP claims, the medical professional
 9 treating the claimant implicitly vouches that the treatment is both reasonable,
 10 necessary, and related—otherwise, the treatment provider would violate their
 11 professional code by providing the treatment. *See* RCW 18.130.180 (prohibiting
 12 misrepresentation by all providers licensed by the Washington State
 13 Department of Health). A claims adjuster simply lacks the medical skills and
 14 expertise to deny a claim based on the adjuster’s bare reasonableness, necessity,
 15 or relatedness determination without an IME or records review. Indeed, Travelers
 16 **admitted** that its claims adjusters are unqualified to make such determinations—
 17 the **only** basis for refusing to pay PIP benefits.

18 Moreover, WAC 284-30-395(2) reinforces the prohibition against insurers
 19 refusing to pay PIP benefits based on an insufficient investigation and mere
 20 speculation and conjecture. That regulation provides that when an insurer
 21 “concludes that it intends to deny, limit, or terminate an insured’s” PIP benefits,
 22 it must provide a “written explanation” containing the “true and actual reason for
 23 its action **as provided to the insurer by the medical or health care professional**
 24 **with whom the insurer consulted[.]**” WAC 284-30-395(2) (emphasis added); *see*
 25 also WAC 284-30-380 (generally requiring all insurers to state the specific
 26 grounds for denying a claim). Accordingly, Travelers was required to provide

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 11 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 Ms. Young with the opinion of a medical or healthcare professional to support its
 2 **intention** to refuse to pay or otherwise deny, limit, or terminate her PIP benefits.
 3

4 Any question that the regulation required Travelers to obtain a supporting
 5 medical opinion **before** it denied, limited, or terminated Ms. Young's PIP benefit
 6 payments is resolved by the regulation's legislative history. In publishing WAC
 7 284-30-395(2) as a proposed rule, OIC stated that the regulation was prompted by
 8 hundreds of complaints "about the way insurers deny, limit, or terminate PIP
 9 benefits **after** review of the insured's treatment records or 'independent medical
 10 examinations.'" Cochran Decl. Ex. 16 at 1 (emphasis added). OIC stated that the
 11 "rule is designed to address these complaints." *Id.* at 3. OIC explained that the
 12 rule "requires an insurer **to deny, limit, or terminate claims in writing** and to
 13 provide the 'true and actual' reason for the denial . . ." *Id.* at 1 (emphasis added).
 14 To that end, OIC stated that "After an insurer concludes that it intends to deny,
 15 limit, or terminate an insured's medical or hospital benefits, the insurer shall
 16 advise an insured in writing." *Id.* at 2. In other words, after an insurer concludes
 17 that it **intends** to deny, limit, or terminate PIP payments, it must **formally** deny,
 18 limit, or terminate those payments **in writing** (emphasis added). Necessarily
 19 implicit in this requirement is the fact that an insurer must **already have** obtained
 20 a supporting medical opinion when making the decision to deny PIP payments—
 21 otherwise it is unable to provide its insured with the written "reason for its action
 22 as provided to the insurer by the medical or health care professional with whom
 23 the insurer **consulted.**" *Id.* at 6 (emphasis added).

24 Taken altogether, an insurer unreasonably and unlawfully refuses to pay
 25 PIP benefits on the basis of a perceived reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness
 26 issue without a supporting medical opinion from an actual medical or health care
 professional with whom the insurer consulted, not an insurer's lay employee.

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 100374
 100375
 100376
 100377
 100378
 100379
 100380
 100381
 100382
 100383
 100384
 100385
 100386
 100387
 100388
 100389
 100390<br

1 Thus, when an insurer refuses to pay PIP benefits without providing any written
 2 explanation of a provider's reasons justifying that decision, it *inherently* refuses
 3 to pay PIP benefits based on speculation and conjecture, not the required medical
 4 basis, in violation of WAC 284-30-330(4). Likewise, when an insurer refuses to
 5 pay PIP benefits without providing written notice of the medical opinions
 6 supporting its refusal, it violates WAC 284-30-395(2).

7 Accordingly, Travelers's practice of refusing to pay Ms. Young's and other
 8 Washington State insureds' PIP benefits based solely on a claims adjuster's
 9 review of medical records is a refusal based on speculation and conjecture in
 10 violation of WAC 284-30-330(4). Likewise, Traveler's practice of denying PIP
 11 benefits without providing written notice of the medical opinions supporting the
 12 denial violates WAC 284-30-395(2). And both of these unreasonable practices
 13 violate WAC 284-30-330(3), which prohibits insurers from "[f]ailing to adopt and
 14 implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation of claims arising
 15 under insurance policies." Travelers expressly adopted and implemented
 16 standards which unreasonably allowed its claims adjusters to refuse to pay PIP
 17 benefits without first obtaining a supporting medical opinion and providing an
 18 insured with WAC 284-30-395(2)'s required written notice.³

19
 20
 21 ³ Accepting Travelers's position that it may indefinitely refuse payment of
 22 an insured's PIP benefits *until* it obtains its own supporting medical opinion
 23 regarding reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness would completely undermine
 24 PIP's purpose. PIP is no-fault insurance, "the purpose of which is to provide for
 25 *speedy payment of medical bills* and compensation for lost income for accident
 26 victims." 7A Am.Jur.2d Auto. Ins. § 521 (emphasis added). Consistent with this
 common understanding of PIP's purpose, the Washington State Supreme Court

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1
 2
 3 has explained that PIP is “essentially no-fault coverage for medical expenses
 4 arising from bodily injuries sustained in an automobile accident,” *Van Noy v. State*
 5 *Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 142 Wn.2d 784, 787, 16 P.3d 574 (2001). Likewise,
 6 the Washington State Court of Appeals has explained:

7 “The no-fault insurance system and personal injury protection (PIP)
 8 benefits are intended to provide victims of motor vehicle accidents
 9 adequate and ***prompt reparation*** for certain economic losses at the
 10 lowest cost to both the individual and the no-fault insurance system.
 11 The individual victim is benefited through ***quick compensation*** for
 12 economic losses incurred as a result of the accident, [irrespective] of
 13 fault and without having to bring a lawsuit.”

14 *Ainsworth v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*, 180 Wn. App. 52, 62, 322 P.3d 6, 12
 15 (2014) (emphasis added) (quoting 12 Steven Plitt, Daniel Maldonado & Joshua
 16 D. Rogers, *Couch on Insurance* 3d § 171:45, at 171–46 (2006)).

17 In contrast, requiring insurers to obtain a supporting medical opinion on
 18 reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness before denying PIP payments is
 19 consistent with PIP’s commonly-understood purpose in Washington and other
 20 states. For example, New York courts have held that the “primary purpose” of
 21 PIP and other no-fault insurance is “to assure claimants of ***expeditious***
 22 ***compensation*** for their injuries through ***prompt payment*** of first-party benefits
 23 without regard to fault and without expense to them.” *Dermatossian v. New York*
 24 *City Transit Auth.*, 67 N.Y.2d 219, 225, 492 N.E.2d 1200, 1203 (1986). To
 25 effectuate this common purpose of PIP, New York courts have held that a refusal
 26 to pay no-fault benefits premised on a medical reason, such as lack of
 reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness, “must be supported by competent
 evidence, such as an independent medical examination or peer review, or other
 proof, which sets forth a factual basis and a ***medical rationale*** for denying the

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 **D. Traveler's Practice of "Suspending" PIP Benefit Payments Before**
 2 **Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Breaches Its Duty of Good**
 3 **Faith to Ms. Young and its Washington Insureds**

4 An insurer breaches its duty of good faith if it employs unfair or deceptive
 5 "methods, acts, or practices" in "the business of insurance." RCW 48.30.010;
 6 *Tank v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 105 Wn. 2d 381, 386, 715 P.2d 1133 (1986)
 7 (RCW 48.30.010 imposes a duty of good faith on insurers). Even a single
 8 violation of WAC 284-30 may constitute bad faith. *Kallevig*, 114 Wn.2d at 924.
 9 WAC 284-30-300 defines certain minimum standards which insurers must follow.
 10 A violation of any one of these provisions constitutes an unfair claims settlement
 11 practice and thus a violation of RCW 48.30.010's duty of good faith imposed on
 12 insurers. *Kallevig*, 114 Wn.2d at 923; *Tank*, 105 Wn.2d at 386 (violations of
 13 WAC 284-30-300 *et seq.* "constitute a breach of an insurer's duty of good faith");
 14 *Anderson v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co.*, 101 Wn. App. 323, 331, 2 P.3d 1029
 15 (2000). Likewise, WAC 284-30-395 expressly declares that violations of its
 16 requirements are "unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or
 17 practices in the business of insurance."

18 Here, by refusing to pay PIP benefits based on an IME demand—without
 19 obtaining and providing written explanation of a valid medical basis for the
 20 refusal—Travelers violated WAC 284-30-295(2) and multiple provisions of
 21 WAC 284-30-330. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment on the

22

 23 claim." *Forest Rehab. Med. P.C. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 44 Misc. 3d 476, 481, 990
 24 N.Y.S.2d 788, 791 (Civ. Ct. 2014) (emphasis added).

25
 26 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 15 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 duty and breach elements of her common law bad faith cause of action based on
 2 this practice.

3 **E. Traveler’s Practice of “Suspending” PIP Benefit Payments Before
 4 Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Violates the CPA**

5 The five elements of a CPA claim are: (1) an unfair or deceptive act or
 6 practice; (2) occurring in trade or commerce; (3) public interest impact; (4) injury
 7 to the plaintiff; (5) and causation. *Hangman Ridge Training Stables, Inc. v. Safeco*
 8 *Title Ins. Co.*, 105 Wn.2d 778, 785-90, 719 P.2d 531 (1986). Any violation of the
 9 claims handling provisions set forth in WAC 284-30-330 et seq. satisfies the first
 10 two elements of a CPA claim. *Hayden v. Mut. of Enumclaw Ins. Co.*, 141 Wn.2d
 11 55, 62, 1 P.3d 1167 (2000). Under RCW 48.01.030, the third element is satisfied
 12 because the legislature has declared that insurance is a business affected by the
 13 public interest. *Ins. Co. of State of Pa. v. Highlands Ins. Co.*, 59 Wn. App. 782,
 14 786, 801 P.2d 284 (1990). Moreover, WAC 284-30-395 expressly defines
 15 violations of its requirements as “unfair methods of competition and unfair or
 16 deceptive acts or practices in the business of insurance specifically applicable to
 17 automobile personal injury protection insurance,” satisfying the first three
 18 elements. Thus, once a violation of either WAC is demonstrated, the plaintiff
 19 need only demonstrate injury and causation.

20 As discussed above, Traveler’s practice of refusing to pay PIP benefits
 21 based on an IME demand without obtaining and providing notice of a supporting
 22 medical opinion violates WAC 284-30-330(3), 330(4), and 395(2). Accordingly,
 23 Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment on the first three elements of her CPA
 24 claim based on this theory.

25 **F. Traveler’s Practice of “Suspending” PIP Benefit Payments Before
 26 Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Breaches the Insurance
 Contract**

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 Insurance contracts, like all other contracts, incorporate an implied
 2 covenant of good faith and fair dealing. *Coventry Associates v. Am. States Ins.*
 3 *Co.*, 136 Wn.2d 269, 281, 961 P.2d 933 (1998). Travelers's unreasonable, bad
 4 faith conduct in unlawfully refusing to pay PIP benefits based on an IME demand
 5 without obtaining and providing notice of a supporting medical opinion breaches
 6 its contracts with its insureds.

7 **G. Traveler's Practice of "Suspending" PIP Benefit Payments Before
 8 Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Violates IFCA**

9 Under IFCA, an insurance policyholder who has been "unreasonably
 10 denied a claim for coverage or payment of benefits by their insurer" may file an
 11 action for damages. RCW 48.30.015(1). "[S]ubsection (1) describes two
 12 separate acts giving rise to an IFCA claim. The insured must show that the insurer
 13 unreasonably denied a claim for coverage *or* that the insurer unreasonably denied
 14 payment of benefits. If either or both acts are established, a claim exists under
 15 IFCA." *Perez-Crisantos v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 187 Wn 2d 669, 683,
 16 389 P.3d 476 (2017) (quoting *Ainsworth*, 180 Wn. App. at 79).

17 As discussed above, an insurer's refusal to pay PIP benefits based on mere
 18 speculation and conjecture is unreasonable bad faith as a matter of law.
 19 Specifically, an insurer's failure to pay PIP benefits on a perceived
 20 reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness issue without a valid medical basis—i.e.,
 21 a supporting medical opinion—is based on speculation and conjecture and
 22 unreasonable as a matter of law. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to summary
 23 judgment on the issue of whether Travelers violated IFCA.

24 **H. Traveler's Practice of "Suspending" PIP Benefit Payments Before
 25 Obtaining a Supporting Medical Opinion Is Negligent**

26
**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 17 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
 Tacoma, WA 98402
 Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 Finally, an insurer owes a duty to exercise reasonable care with respect to
 2 the interest of its insured. *Ramirez-Yanez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, No. C12-732 MJP,
 3 2013 WL 1499199, at *4 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 11, 2013). Even if an insurer acts in
 4 good faith, it is liable to its insured for any proximal negligence. *Ramirez-Yanez*,
 5 2013 WL 1499199, at *4. Negligence requires: (1) a duty to conform to a certain
 6 standard of conduct owed to the complaining party; (2) a breach of that duty; and
 7 (3) a showing the breach was the proximate cause of the complaining party's
 8 injury, and (4) legally compensable damages. *Id.*

9 Again, as discussed above, Travelers's refusal to pay PIP benefits on a
 10 perceived reasonableness, necessity, or relatedness issue without a valid medical
 11 basis constitutes unreasonable conduct as a matter of law. Moreover, as
 12 Travelers's own bad faith expert, David Mandt, has averred as an insurance
 13 industry expert under oath in other proceedings,

14 The standards prescribed by the Washington Administrative
 15 Code, in my opinion, set forth the minimum standard of care for
 16 insurers handling claims in the state of Washington. Accordingly, to
 17 whatever extent Hartford's standards do not conform to those set
 18 forth in the Washington Administrative Code they are, by definition,
 19 unreasonable and fall below the minimum required standard of care.

20 Cochran Decl. Ex. 17 at 80-81 ¶ 11. Accordingly, because Plaintiff demonstrates
 21 violations of multiple WAC provisions based on Traveler's practice, she is
 22 entitled to summary judgment on the issues of duty and breach.

23 V. CONCLUSION

24 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to enter an
 25 order denying Travelers's motion in its entirety.

26 ////

 ////

 ////

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 18 of 20



911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of May, 2019.
2
3
4

PFAU COCHRAN VERTETIS AMALA PLLC

5 By: /s/ Darrell L. Cochran
6 Darrell L. Cochran, WSBA No. 22851
7 Loren A. Cochran, WSBA No. 32773
8 Christopher E. Love, WSBA No. 42832
9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10
11 ARMITAGE & THOMPSON, PLLC

12 By: /s/ J.J. Thompson
13 J.J. Thompson, WSBA No. 40462
14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

No. 2:18-cv-31-RMP | 19 of 20

 PFAU COCHRAN
VERTETIS AMALA
A Professional Limited Liability Company

911 Pacific Avenue, Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone: (253) 777-0799 Facsimile: (253) 627-0654

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, **Sarah Awes**, hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I am employed at Pfau Cochran Vertetis Amala PLLC and that on today's date, I placed for service the foregoing by directing delivery to the following individuals:

Thomas Lether
Eric Neal
Lether & Associates PLLC
1848 West Lake Avenue North, Suite 100
Seattle, WA 98109

Attorneys for Defendant

JJ Thompson
ARMITAGE & THOMPSON, PLLC
220 W. Main Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201

Attorney for Plaintiff

DATED this 3rd day of May, 2019.

/s/ Sarah Awes
Sarah Awes
Legal Assistant